



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,035	06/04/2004	Arvind Prabhakar	03226/493002; SUN040039	4145
33615 7590 04/07/2008 OSHA LIANG I.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010				
EXAMINER				
MAL, KEVIN S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2152				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/07/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lord@oshaliang.com

hernandez@oshaliang.com

DOCKETING@OSHALIANG.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/618,035

Applicant(s)

PRABHAKAR ET AL.

Examiner

KEVIN S. MAI

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-893)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 30 have been examined and are pending.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
- Page 9 lines 6-7 – The use of the number 200 twice: once for ‘Internet Browsing Environment’ and once for ‘computer server.’
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-30 all appear to be claiming only software and as such are seen to be claiming non statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. No. 5892919 to Nielsen (hereinafter “Nielsen”).

6. **As to Claim 27, Nielsen discloses a computer implemented method of translating Internet access addresses, comprising:**

defining a plurality of web address storage units (Column 3 lines 10-15 of Nielsen disclose maintaining a cache of entries relating incorrect addresses submitted by users with correct addresses. As to being a plurality of storage units, each entry is seen to be an individual unit of storage);

defining a plurality of fully qualified domain names corresponding to a plurality of web addresses (Figure 3 shows the correct URL corresponding with the web addresses. The correct URLs are seen to have all 3 components of a FQDN as defined by the applicant); **and**

translating incoming HTTP request addresses to corresponding fully qualified domain names (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a table that holds entries that are incorrect URLs and matches them with correct URLs. Column 2 lines 55-60 disclose that this is used to transparently correct URLs, instructing the browser to return the document addressed by the corrected URL. Thus it is seen that the invalid address has been translated into a valid fully qualified domain name).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3, 9, 21-23 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen.

9. **As to Claim 1**, Nielsen discloses **a computer system comprising:**

a web browser for browsing web sites on the Internet (Column 5 lines 20-25 of Nielsen disclose the user's computing device running a network browser such as a WWW browser software);

a plurality of user defined data storage units having similarly defined but independently invisible address information to said web sites (Column 3 lines 10-15 of Nielsen disclose maintaining a cache of entries relating incorrect addresses submitted by users with correct addresses. The entries are shown in figure 3 and it is seen that they are similarly defined but also independent of each other. As to being a plurality of storage units, each entry is seen to be an individual unit of storage); **and**

a web address translation system for translating user web access request addresses to said web sites to corresponding predefined fully qualified domain names (Column 2 lines 47-51 of Nielsen disclose providing a user who manually enters a network address with a sophisticated method for correcting that address).

Furthermore it is disclosed in column 2 lines 20-30 that the state of the prior art includes browsers automatically trying to identify and correct problems with the protocol and server's

domain name. The program will try to add "www." before and ".com" after the domain name if they are not present. This is seen as translating all requests into the corresponding FQDN because requests are automatically modified into FQDNs)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further add the prior art of correcting domain names as disclosed by Nielsen. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine because Nielsen discloses that if the invention's corrected URL still points to a server that cannot be found the spell check on the issued URL will be performed in accordance with the prior art (column 6 lines 45-50).

10. **As to Claim 2**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 1 **wherein said web address translation system detects address differences between a user web access request address and a predefined fully qualified domain name** (Column 2 lines 20-30 of Nielsen disclose trying to identify and correct problems with the manually entered URL. Identifying the problem involves checking to see if "www." and ".com" are present before and after the domain name in the entered URL. Thus it is seen that identifying is finding the difference between a request and a fully qualified domain name).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 1.

11. **As to Claim 3**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 1 **wherein said user web access request address contains an invalid access address to said web sites** (Column 2 lines 47-51 of Nielsen disclose providing user who manually enters a

network address with a sophisticated method for correcting an address. It is seen that if the method exist to correct an address then the address must have been invalid).

12. **As to Claim 9**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 1 wherein said plurality of user defined data storage units are cookies (Column 7 lines 36-40 of Nielsen discloses using cookies for authentication and tracking).

Nielsen does not explicitly disclose the cookies being used to store address information however the applicant discloses in the background of their application (page 2 lines 15-20) that cookies typically contain a range of URLs. Thus it is seen that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the cookies disclosed by Nielsen for storing address information because they are already known in the art to do so.

13. **As to Claim 21**, Nielsen discloses a web browser comprising: a plurality of user defined data storage units each comprising contents that are invisible to the other units (Column 3 lines 10-15 of Nielsen disclose maintaining a cache of entries relating incorrect addresses submitted by users with correct addresses. The entries are shown in figure 3 and it is seen that they are similarly defined but also independent of each other. As to being a plurality of storage units, each entry is seen to be an individual unit of storage); and an addressing reconciliation system for reconciling address differences between uniform resource locator addresses and predefined fully qualified domain names (Column 2 lines 20-30 of Nielsen disclose trying to identify and correct problems with the manually entered URL. Identifying the problem involves checking to see if "www." and ".com" are present before an

after the domain name in the entered URL. Thus it is seen that identifying is finding the difference between a request and a fully qualified domain name).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 1.

14. **As to Claim 22**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 21 wherein said plurality of user defined data storage units store a plurality of said uniform resource locator addresses (Column 3 lines 10-15 of Nielsen disclose maintaining a cache of entries relating incorrect addresses submitted by users with correct addresses. It is seen in figure 3 that these contain URLs).

15. **As to Claim 23**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 21 wherein said address reconciliation system comprises detection logic for automatically detecting address differences between said uniform resource locator addresses and incoming HTTP request addresses from a user and to said web browser (Column 2 lines 20-30 of Nielsen disclose trying to identify and correct problems with the manually entered URL. Identifying the problem involves checking to see if "www." and ".com" are present before an after the domain name in the entered URL. Thus it is seen that identifying is finding the difference between a request and a fully qualified domain name).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 1.

16. **As to Claim 28**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 27 wherein said translating comprises detecting address differences between an incoming

HTTP request address and a corresponding predefined fully qualified domain name

(Column 2 lines 20-30 of Nielsen disclose trying to identify and correct problems with the manually entered URL. Identifying the problem involves checking to see if "www." and ".com" are present before and after the domain name in the entered URL. Thus it is seen that identifying is finding the difference between a request and a fully qualified domain name).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 1.

17. **As to Claim 29**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 28 wherein said translating further comprises translating said HTTP request address to a web address stored in said plurality of web address storage units (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a table that holds entries that are incorrect URLs and matches them with correct URLs. Column 2 lines 55-60 disclose that this is used to transparently correct URLs, instructing the browser to return the document addressed by the corrected URL. Thus it is seen that the invalid address has been translated into a valid fully qualified domain name).

18. **As to Claim 30**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 29 wherein said plurality of web address storage units are cookies (Column 7 lines 36-40 of Nielsen discloses using cookies for authentication and tracking).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 9.

19. Claims 4-8, 10-20, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen and further in view of US Pat. 6151624 to Teare et al. (hereinafter "Teare").

20. **As to Claim 4**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 1. Nielsen does not explicitly disclose **wherein said web address translation system comprises an address detection module for automatically determining whether said incoming user web access request address comprises a valid address mappable to a predefined fully qualified domain name.**

However, Teare discloses this (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in a browser's network address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table (606). The override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs. Thus it is seen that the system automatically determines if the incoming request is a valid address mapping to a predefined domain name).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the system of claim 1 as disclosed by Nielsen, with automatically determining whether incoming user requests are valid addresses mappable to FQDNs as disclosed by Teare. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine because it is desirable to have a way to access information available over the Web using a natural language word or "real" name associated with the information (column 4 lines 4-6).

21. **As to Claim 5**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 4 **wherein said web address translation system further comprises an address redirection unit for redirecting invalid address in said plurality of user defined data storage units to said predefined fully qualified domain names** (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a table that holds

entries that are incorrect URLs and matches them with correct URLs. Column 2 lines 55-60 disclose that this is used to transparently correct URLs, instructing the browser to return the document addressed by the corrected URL. Thus it is seen that invalid address are redirected to fully qualified domain names).

22. **As to Claim 6**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 5 wherein said web address translation system further comprises a fully qualified domain name translation module for translating invalid addresses in said user web access request address to valid predefined fully qualified domain names (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a table that holds entries that are incorrect URLs and matches them with correct URLs. Column 2 lines 55-60 disclose that this is used to transparently correct URLs, instructing the browser to return the document addressed by the corrected URL. Thus it is seen that the invalid address has been translated into a valid fully qualified domain name).

23. **As to Claim 7**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 6 wherein said user web access request address comprise Uniform Resource Locator (URL) addresses (Column 5 lines 49-51 of Nielsen disclose a user issuing a GET command for a network address such as a URL) and wherein said web address translation system further comprises a fully qualified domain name mapping module for mapping invalid addresses to said valid predefined fully qualified domain names (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a table that hold entries that are incorrect URLs and matches them with correct URLs. This is seen as having mapped invalid addressed to valid ones).

24. **As to Claim 8**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 7 wherein said web address translation system further comprises a fully qualified domain name default setting module for setting a default fully qualified domain name to which said invalid URL maps (Column 24 lines 1 - 10 of Teare disclose if the real name is not in the override table (invalid URL) the service constructs a URL that references a pre-determined location of the system that implements a Resolver. Thus it is seen that invalid URLs are sent to a default location).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the system of claim 7 as disclosed by Nielsen-Teare, with mapping invalid addresses to a default location as disclosed by Teare. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine in order to provide a further method of attempting to correct a user's request. The Resolver is disclosed in column 10 lines 20-30 to receive requests containing a real name, and converts the real name into a network address. Thus it is seen that if the mapping is not found in the original override table, an attempt can be made by going to the location of the Resolver. Thus it is seen that it would be obvious to implement this to further increase the ability of the invention to help users obtain their desired websites.

25. **As to Claim 10**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 8 wherein said web address translation system further comprises address aliasing process for translating user defined web address aliases into said predefined fully qualified domain names (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in a browser's network address

field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table (606). The override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs. This is seen to be associating aliases with predefined FQDNs).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 4.

26. **As to Claim 11, Nielsen discloses a browser system, comprising:**

Nielsen does not explicitly disclose **a data collection module for automatically searching a plurality of user defined web sites to detect and retrieve content; and**

However, Teare discloses this (Column 18 lines 38-45 of Teare disclose a Crawler the polls Web sites on the Internet to locate customer sites that have updates. Then column 18 lines 50-51 disclose the Crawler updating the database automatically)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the browser system as disclosed by Nielsen, with automatically searching websites to retrieve content as disclosed by Teare. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine provide the most correct information to users. Since the invention of Nielsen deals with preventing a user from going to an incorrect website, it would be obvious to keep the information regarding the websites as up to date as possible. As Teare discloses in column 2 lines 63-65 a URL that is accurate one day might be inaccurate the next day.

a web address translation unit for translating uniform resource locator addresses into corresponding predefined fully qualified domain names (Column 2 lines 47-51 of Nielsen disclose providing a user who manually enters a network address with a sophisticated method for correcting that address. Column 5 lines 49-51 disclose the request being a URL).

Furthermore it is disclosed in column 2 lines 20-30 that the state of the prior art includes browsers automatically trying to identify and correct problems with the protocol and server's domain name. The program will try to add "www." before and ".com" after the domain name if they are not present. This is seen as translating all requests into the corresponding FQDN because requests are automatically modified into FQDNs.

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 1.

27. **As to Claim 12**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 11 wherein said web address translation unit reconciles address differences between said uniform resource locator addresses and said predefined fully qualified domain names (Column 2 lines 20-30 of Nielsen disclose trying to identify and correct problems with the manually entered URL. Correcting involves inserting "www." and ".com" if they are not present in the entered URL. This is seen as reconciling the differences between the entered address and the FQDN).

28. **As to Claim 13**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 11 wherein said uniform resource locator addresses contain invalid access address to corresponding web sites (Column 2 lines 47-51 of Nielsen disclose providing user who manually enters a network address with a sophisticated method for correcting an address. It is seen that if the method exist to correct an address then the address must have been invalid).

29. **As to Claim 14**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 12 wherein said web address translation unit comprises an address detection module for automatically determining whether said uniform resource locator addresses comprise valid addresses mappable to said predefined fully qualified domain names (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in a browser's network address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table (606). The override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs. Thus it is seen that the system automatically determines if the incoming request is a valid address mapping to a predefined domain name).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 4.

30. **As to Claim 15**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 13 wherein said web address translation unit further comprises an address redirection unit for redirecting said invalid addresses to said predefined fully qualified domain names (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a table that holds entries that are incorrect URLs and matches them with correct URLs. Column 2 lines 55-60 disclose that this is used to transparently correct URLs, instructing the browser to return the document addressed by the corrected URL. Thus it is seen that invalid address are redirected to fully qualified domain names).

31. **As to Claim 16**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 15 wherein said web address translation unit further comprises a fully qualified domain name translation module for translating invalid addresses in said uniform resource locator addresses to corresponding predefined fully qualified domain names (Figure 3 of Nielsen

discloses a table that holds entries that are incorrect URLs and matches them with correct URLs. Column 2 lines 55-60 disclose that this is used to transparently correct URLs, instructing the browser to return the document addressed by the corrected URL. Thus it is seen that the invalid address has been translated into a valid fully qualified domain name).

32. **As to Claim 17**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 16 wherein said web address translation unit further comprises a fully qualified domain name mapping module for mapping invalid uniform resource locator addresses to said corresponding predefined fully qualified domain names (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a table that hold entries that are incorrect URLs and matches them with correct URLs. This is seen as having mapped invalid addressed to valid ones).

33. **As to Claim 18**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 17 wherein said web address translation unit further comprises a fully qualified domain name default setting module for setting a default fully qualified domain name to which said invalid uniform resource locator addresses maps (Column 24 lines 1 - 10 of Teare disclose if the real name is not in the override table (invalid URL) the service constructs a URL that references a pre-determined location of the system that implements a Resolver. Thus it is seen that invalid URLs are sent to a default location).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 8.

34. **As to Claim 19**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 18 wherein said web address translation unit further comprises address aliasing process for translating user defined web address aliases into said predefined fully qualified domain names (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in a browser's network address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table (606). The override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs. This is seen to be associating aliases with predefined FQDNs).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 4.

35. **As to Claim 20**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 11 wherein said data collection module is a cookie (Column 7 lines 36-40 of Nielsen discloses using cookies for authentication and tracking).

Nielsen does not explicitly disclose the cookies being used to implement the data collection module however Teare discloses the Crawler reading a database to find where to poll (column 18 lines 1-20) and . Since cookies are known to contain a range of URLs it is seen that would have been obvious to have the Crawler read cookies to find where to poll. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to invention was made to do so because cookies are known to typically contain URLs for the sites that a user visits.

36. **As to Claim 24**, Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 23. Nielsen does not explicitly disclose wherein said address reconciliation unit further comprises an address detection module for automatically determining whether said

uniform resource locator addresses comprise valid addresses mappable to said predefined fully qualified domain names.

However, Teare discloses this (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in a browser's network address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table (606). The override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs. Thus it is seen that the system automatically determines if the incoming request is a valid address mapping to a predefined domain name).

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 4.

37. **As to Claim 25**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 24 wherein said address reconciliation system further comprises an address redirection unit for redirecting invalid address in said plurality of data storage units to ones of said predefined fully qualified domain names (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a table that holds entries that are incorrect URLs and matches them with correct URLs. Column 2 lines 55-60 disclose that this is used to transparently correct URLs, instructing the browser to return the document addressed by the corrected URL. Thus it is seen that invalid address are redirected to fully qualified domain names).

38. **As to Claim 26**, Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 25 wherein said address reconciliation system further comprises a fully qualified domain name translation module for translating invalid addresses in said uniform resource locator addresses to valid predefined fully qualified domain names (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a

Art Unit: 2152

table that holds entries that are incorrect URLs and matches them with correct URLs. Column 2 lines 55-60 disclose that this is used to transparently correct URLs, instructing the browser to return the document addressed by the corrected URL. Thus it is seen that the invalid address has been translated into a valid fully qualified domain name).

Conclusion

39. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 20030014450 A1 - Auto-correcting URL-parser to Hoffman, Richard Dale

US 20040019697 A1 - Method and system for correcting the spelling of incorrectly spelled uniform resource locators using closest alphabetical match technique to Rose, Chris

US 20040044768 A1 - Reverse proxy mediator for servers to Takahashi, Koichi

US 20050192896 A1 - Method and apparatus for ordering goods, services and content over an internetwork using a virtual payment account to Hutchison, Robin B. et al.

US 20050235031 A1 - Hyperlink Generation And Enhanced Spell Check Method, Product, Apparatus, And User Interface System to Schneider, Eric et al.

US 20080016233 A1 - Methods, Systems, Products, And Devices For Processing Dns Friendly Identifiers to Schneider; Eric

US 5727129 A - Network system for profiling and actively facilitating user activities to Barrett; Robert Carl et al.

US 5907680 A - Client-side, server-side and collaborative spell check of URL's to Nielsen; Jakob

US 6041324 A - System and method for identifying valid portion of computer resource identifier to Earl; Joel Ray et al.

US 6092100 A - Method for intelligently resolving entry of an incorrect uniform resource locator (URL) to Berstis; Viktors et al.

US 6332158 B1 - Domain name system lookup allowing intelligent correction of searches and presentation of auxiliary information to Risley; Chris et al.

US 7136932 B1 - Fictitious domain name method, product, and apparatus to Schneider; Eric

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN S. MAI whose telephone number is (571)270-5001. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2152

KSM

/Bunjod Jaroenchonwanit/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152